Randomness extraction via a quantum generalization of the conditional collision entropy

Yodai Watanabe, *Member, IEEE*

arXiv:1703.10326v1 [cs.IT] 30 Mar 2017

***Abstract*—Randomness extraction against side information is the art of distilling from a given source a key which is almost uniform conditioned on the side information. This paper provides randomness extraction against quantum side information whose extractable key length is given by a quantum generalization of the conditional collision entropy defined without the conventional smoothing. Based on the fact that the collision entropy is not sub-additive, the quantum conditional collision entropy maximized with respect to additional side information is introduced, and is shown to be asymptotically optimal. The lower bound on it derived there ensures faster convergence to the conditional von Neumann entropy than that on the smooth min-entropy.**

***Index Terms*—Randomness extraction; Quantum collision entropy; Extractable key length**

I. Introduction

Consider a random variable X and a quantum state ρ correlated to X. The task of randomness extraction from source X against side information ρ is to distill an almost random key S from X. Here the randomness of S is measured by the trace distance between the composite systems (S,ρ) and (U,ρ), where U is a random variable uniformly distributed and independent of ρ. A major application of randomness extraction is privacy amplification [1], [8], whose task is to transform a partially secure key into a highly secure key in the presence of an adversary with side information.

It has been shown that a two-universal hash function [3] can be used to provide randomness extraction against quantum side information, in which the extractable key length is lower-bounded by a quantum generalization of the conditional min-entropy [7]. The extractable key length can also be given by a quantum generalization of the conditional collision entropy (conditional Rényi entropy of order 2) [7], [8]. It should be stated that the collision entropy is lower-bounded by the min-entropy and so gives a better extractable key length than the min-entropy, while the min-entropy has several useful properties such as the monotonicity under quantum operations.

The conventional way to consider a tighter bound on the length of an extractable almost random key is to generalize entropies by the smoothing. In fact, the existing extractable key lengths have been described by smooth entropies, which are defined as the maximization of entropies with respect to quantum states within a small ball (see e.g. [6]–[10]). More precisely, let $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ be finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces, and $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ and $\mathcal{S}_{\le}(\mathcal{H})$ denote the sets of normalized and sub-normalized quantum states on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, respectively; then, for example, the smooth min-entropy $H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(A|B)_{\rho}$ of system A conditioned on system B of a state $\rho\in\mathcal{S}_{\le}(\mathcal{H}_A\otimes\mathcal{H}_B)$ is defined by

$$H_{\min}^{\epsilon}(A|B)_{\rho}=\max_{\rho'\in B^{\epsilon}(\rho)}H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho'},$$
$$H_{\min}(A|B)_{\rho}=\max_{\sigma\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_B)}\sup\{\lambda|2^{-\lambda}I_A\otimes\sigma\ge\rho\},$$

where I_A denotes the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}_A$, and $B^{\epsilon}(\rho)=\left\{\rho'\in\mathcal{S}_{\le}(\mathcal{H})\middle|C(\rho,\rho')\le\epsilon\right\}$ for $\epsilon>0$ and $\rho\in\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H})$ with $C(\rho,\rho')=\sqrt{1-F^2(\rho,\rho')}$ and $F(\rho,\rho')=\mathrm{Tr}\left[\sqrt{\rho}\sqrt{\rho'}\right]$. This paper introduces a quantum generalization of the conditional collision entropy defined without this conventional smoothing, and provides randomness extraction against quantum side information whose extractable key length is given by the quantum conditional collision entropy.

II. Preliminaries

Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space. For an Hermitian operator X on $\mathcal{H}$ with spectral decomposition $X=\sum_i\lambda_iE_i$, let $\{X\ge0\}$ denote the projection on $\mathcal{H}$ given by

$$\{X\ge0\}=\sum_{i:\lambda_i\ge0}E_i.$$

The projections $\{X>0\}$, $\{X\le0\}$ and $\{X<0\}$ are defined analogously. Let A and B be positive operators on $\mathcal{H}$. The trace distance $d_1(A,B)$ and the relative entropy $D(A||B)$ between A and B are defined as

$$d_1(A,B)=\mathrm{Tr}[(A-B)\{A-B\ge0\}],$$
$$D(A||B)=\mathrm{Tr}[A(\log_2A-\log_2B)],$$

respectively, where $\log_2$ denotes the logarithm to base 2. The von Neumann entropy of A is defined as

$$S(A)=-\mathrm{Tr}A\log_2A.$$

For an operator $X>0$, let X' denote the normalization of X; that is, $X'=X/\mathrm{Tr}[X]$. It then follows from $S(A')\le\mathrm{rank}A'=\mathrm{rank}A$ and $D(A'||B')\ge0$ that

$$S(A)\le\mathrm{Tr}[A]\big(\mathrm{rank}A-\log_2\mathrm{Tr}[A]\big),\tag{1}$$
$$D(A||B)\ge\mathrm{Tr}[A]\big(\log_2\mathrm{Tr}[A]-\log_2\mathrm{Tr}[B]\big).\tag{2}$$

More generally, it can be shown that inequality (1) holds for $A\ge0$ and inequality (2) holds for $A,B\ge0$ such that $\mathrm{supp}A\subset\mathrm{supp}B$, by using the convention $0\log_20=0$, which can be justified by taking the limit, $\lim_{\epsilon\to+0}\epsilon\log_2\epsilon=0$.

Let f be an operator convex function on an interval $J\subset\mathbb{R}$. Let $\{X_i\}_i$ be a set of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ with their spectrum in J, and $\{C_i\}_i$ be a set of operators on $\mathcal{H}$ such that $\sum_iC_i^{\dagger}C_i=I$,

This work was supported in part by a Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) No. 21700021.

The author is with Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Aizu, Aizu-Wakamatsu City, Fukushima 9658580, Japan (e-mail: yodai@u-aizu.ac.jp).

where I is the identity operator on $\mathcal{H}$. Then Jensen's operator inequality for f, $\{X_i\}_i$ and $\{C_i\}_i$ is given by

$$f\Big(\sum_i C_i^\dagger X_i C_i\Big) \le \sum_i C_i^\dagger f(X_i) C_i \tag{3}$$

(see e.g. [2], [5]).

Let $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be finite sets and $\mathcal{G}$ be a family of functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{S}$. Let G be a random variable uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{G}$. Then $\mathcal{G}$ is called two-universal, and G is called a two-universal hash function [3], if

$$\Pr[G(x_0) = G(x_1)] \le \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \tag{4}$$

for every distinct $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}$. For example, the family of all functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{S}$ is two-universal. A more useful two-universal family is that of all linear functions from $\{0,1\}^n$ to $\{0,1\}^m$. More efficient families, which can be described using $O(n+m)$ bits and have a polynomial-time evaluating algorithms, are discussed in [3], [12].

Let X be a random variable over a finite set $\mathcal{X}$ and ρ be a quantum state on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. In considering the composite system (X, ρ), it may help to introduce a Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{|x\rangle\}_{x\in\mathcal{X}}$ and define the classical-quantum state $\sigma(X,\rho)$ by

$$\sigma(X,\rho) = \sum_x p_x |x\rangle\langle x| \otimes \rho_x,$$

where $p_x = \Pr[X = x]$ for $x \in \mathcal{X}$, and ρ_x denotes the quantum state ρ conditioned on $X = x$. Then the distance $d(X|Z,\rho)$ from uniform of a random variable X given a random variable Z and a quantum state ρ can be defined as

$$d(X|Z,\rho) = d_1(\sigma((X,Z),\rho), \sigma((U,Z),\rho)),$$

where U is a random variable which is uniformly distributed over $\mathcal{X}$ and independent of Z and ρ; namely,

$$\sigma((U,Z),\rho) = \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{X}|}\sum_x |x\rangle\langle x|\right) \otimes \sigma(Z,\rho).$$

Instead of the trace distance, another distance measure may be used to define the distance from uniform. For example, the relative entropy can be used to define the distance from uniform of the form

$$D(X|Z,\rho) = D(\sigma((X,Z),\rho) || \sigma((U,Z),\rho)).$$

Here, Pinsker's inequality $\big(d_1(\rho,\sigma)\big)^2 \le D(\rho||\sigma)$ gives

$$\big(d(X|Z,\rho)\big)^2 \le D(X|Z,\rho),$$

which ensures that an upper bound on $D(X|Z,\rho)$ also gives an upper bound on $d(X|Z,\rho)$. Therefore, in this paper, we will use $D(X|Z,\rho)$, instead of $d(X|Z,\rho)$, as the measure of the distance from uniform.

III. Randomness extraction

Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ be Hilbert spaces, and ρ_{XY} be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$. For $\epsilon \ge 0$, let us define the collision entropy $R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ of ρ_X conditioned on ρ_Y by

$$R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y) = \sup_\lambda \big\{\lambda \big| \mathrm{Tr}\big[\big\{\Lambda - 2^{-\lambda}\rho_*^2 \le 0\big\}\rho_*\big] \ge 1-\epsilon\big\},$$

where we have introduced

$$\Lambda = \mathrm{Tr}_X\big[\rho_{XY}^2\big] \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_* = \rho_Y = \mathrm{Tr}_X\big[\rho_{XY}\big].$$

If ρ_{XY} is a classical-quantum state $\sigma(X,\rho)$ over a composite system (X,ρ) of a random variable X and a quantum state ρ, then the collision entropy $R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$ of X conditioned on ρ is given by

$$R_\epsilon(X|\rho) = \sup_\lambda \big\{\lambda \big| \mathrm{Tr}\big[\big\{\Lambda - 2^{-\lambda}\rho_*^2 \le 0\big\}\rho_*\big] \ge 1-\epsilon\big\} \tag{5}$$

with

$$\Lambda = \sum_x \big(p_x\rho_x\big)^2 \quad \text{and} \quad \rho_* = \sum_x p_x\rho_x.$$

Furthermore, if ρ is purely classical and can be identified with a random variable Z, then $R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$ becomes

$$R_\epsilon(X|Z) = \sup_\lambda \big\{\lambda | \Pr[Z \in \{z | R(X|Z=z) \ge \lambda\}] \ge 1-\epsilon\big\},$$

where $R(X|Z=z) = -\log_2 \sum_x \Pr[X=x|Z=z]^2$. Since $R_\epsilon(X|Z)$ coincides with the (smoothed) conditional collision entropy given by [1], [11], $R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ and $R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$ can be considered as its quantum generalization.

We are now ready to state the main theorem.

Theorem 3.1. Let $\mathcal{H}$ be a Hilbert space, and $\mathcal{X}$ and $\mathcal{S}$ be finite sets. Let ρ be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}$, X be a random variable over $\mathcal{X}$, and G be a random variable, independent of X and ρ, uniformly distributed over a two-universal family of hash functions from $\mathcal{X}$ to $\mathcal{S}$. Then

$$D(S|G,\rho) \le \epsilon \log_2\big(d|\mathcal{S}|\big) + \eta_0(\epsilon) + \frac{\delta+\epsilon+\epsilon^{1/2}}{\ln 2} \tag{6}$$

for $\epsilon \ge 0$, where η_0 is a function on $[0,\infty)$ given by

$$\eta_0(\epsilon) = \begin{cases} -\epsilon\log_2\epsilon & \text{for } 0 \le \epsilon \le 1/2, \\ 1/2 & \text{for } \epsilon > 1/2, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

and we have introduced

$$S = G(X), \quad d = \mathrm{rank}E[\rho] \quad \text{and} \quad \delta = |\mathcal{S}|2^{-R_\epsilon(X|\rho)}.$$

Note that, if the length $s = \log_2|\mathcal{S}|$ of the extracted key S is taken smaller than $R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$, then δ in (6) decreases exponentially in the excess $R_\epsilon(X|\rho) - s$, and hence $R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$ can be considered as the extractable key length.

Proof. Direct calculation shows that

$$\begin{aligned} &D(S|G,\rho) \\ &= \sum_{g,s} p_g \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{sg}\log_2\rho_{sg}\big] - \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_*\log_2\rho_*\big] + \log_2|\mathcal{S}|, \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

where we have defined

$$\rho_{sg} = \sum_x p_x p(g(x)=s)\rho_x. \tag{9}$$

Since the real function $-\log_2$ is operator convex on $(0,\infty)$ (see e.g. [2]), we can estimate the first term of the right-hand side of (8) by applying Jensen's operator inequality as follows. Let $f=-\log_2$ and introduce the operators X_{sg} and C_{sg} by writing

$$X_{sg}=\rho_{sg}+\gamma I \quad \text{and} \quad C_{sg}=(p_g\rho_{sg})^{1/2}P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}$$

for $\gamma>0$, where we have defined

$$\hat{\rho}_*=P\rho_*P \quad \text{and} \quad P=\{\Lambda-2^{-r}\rho_*^2\le 0\}$$

for $r<R_\epsilon(X|\rho)$. It readily follows that $X_{sg}>0$ and $\sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger C_{sg}=P_\rho$, where P_ρ denotes the projection onto the range of $\hat{\rho}_*$. Furthermore, let us define the operators X_+ and C_+ by

$$X_+=I \quad \text{and} \quad C_+=I-P_\rho,$$

so that

$$f(X_+)=0 \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger C_{sg}+C_+^\dagger C_+=I.$$

Then by Jensen's operator inequality (3),

$$f\Big(\sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger X_{sg}C_{sg}+C_+^\dagger X_+C_+\Big)\le\sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger f(X_{sg})C_{sg}.$$

Here, $\sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger X_{sg}C_{sg}$ is an operator on the range $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\rho}_*)$ of $\hat{\rho}_*$, while $C_+^\dagger X_+C_+$ is an operator on its orthogonal complement $\mathcal{R}(\hat{\rho}_*)^\perp$. It thus follows that

$$\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2}f\Big(\sum_{s,g}C_{sg}^\dagger X_{sg}C_{sg}\Big)\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2}\le\sum_{s,g}\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2}C_{sg}^\dagger f(X_{sg})C_{sg}\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2},$$

which, in the limit $\gamma\to+0$, leads to

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{s,g}p_gP\rho_{sg}^{1/2}\big(\log_2\rho_{sg}\big)\rho_{sg}^{1/2}P\\&\le\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2}\bigg(\log_2\sum_{s,g}p_g\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_{sg}^2P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}\bigg)\hat{\rho}_*^{1/2}.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

To estimate the right-hand side of (10), let us estimate the sum $\sum_{s,g}p_gP\rho_{sg}^2P$. Substitution of (9) into this sum gives

$$\sum_{s,g}p_gP\rho_{sg}^2P=\sum_{g,x,x'}p_gp_xp_{x'}p(g(x)=g(x'))P\rho_x\rho_{x'}P.$$

Here, we divide the sum of the right-hand side into two parts so that one part consists of the terms with $x=x'$ and the other part consists of the remaining terms. It follows from the definition of P that the former part can be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{g,x,x':x=x'}p_gp_xp_{x'}p(g(x)=g(x'))P\rho_x\rho_{x'}P&=P\Lambda P\\&\le 2^{-r}P\rho_*^2P.\end{aligned}$$

By using (4), the latter part can also be bounded as

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_{g,x,x':x\ne x'}p_gp_xp_{x'}p(g(x)=g(x'))P\rho_x\rho_{x'}P\\&=\sum_{x,x':x\ne x'}p_xp_{x'}P\rho_x\rho_{x'}P\sum_g p_gp(g(x)=g(x'))\\&\le\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}\sum_{x,x':x\ne x'}p_xp_{x'}P\rho_x\rho_{x'}P\\&\le\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}P\rho_*^2P.\end{aligned}$$

The above two inequalities at once give

$$\sum_{s,g}p_gP\rho_{sg}^2P\le\frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|}(1+\delta_r)P\rho_*^2P\tag{11}$$

with $\delta_r=|\mathcal{S}|2^{-r}$. Note here that $\log_2\rho_{sg}\le 0$ and $\rho_{sg}\ge\rho_{sg}^{1/2}P\rho_{sg}^{1/2}$, and so

$$\sum_{g,s}p_g\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{sg}\log_2\rho_{sg}\big]\le\sum_{s,g}p_g\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_{sg}^{1/2}P\rho_{sg}^{1/2}\log_2\rho_{sg}\big].$$

Therefore, by taking the trace of both sides of (10) and then using (11), we obtain

$$D(S|G,\rho)\le(1-\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_*])\log_2|\mathcal{S}|+\log_2(1+\delta_r)+\Delta,$$

where we have introduced

$$\Delta=\mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_*\log_2\big(\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_*^2P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}\big)\big]-\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_*\log_2\rho_*].$$

Furthermore, by using $\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_*]\ge 1-\epsilon$ and $\log_2(1+x)\le x/\ln 2$ for $x\ge 0$, this inequality can be simplified to

$$D(S|G,\rho)\le\epsilon\log_2|\mathcal{S}|+\frac{\delta_r}{\ln 2}+\Delta.\tag{12}$$

It remains to estimate Δ. Let us write Δ in the form $\Delta=\Delta_1+\Delta_2$, where

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_1&=\mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_*\log_2\big(\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_*^2P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}\big)\big]-\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_*\log_2\hat{\rho}_*],\\\Delta_2&=\mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_*\log_2\hat{\rho}_*]-\mathrm{Tr}[\rho_*\log_2\rho_*].\end{aligned}$$

First, we estimate the first part Δ_1. Let $A=\hat{\rho}_*$ and $B=\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_*^2P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}$. Since

$$B-A=\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_*(I-P)\rho_*P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}\ge 0,$$

and hence $\mathrm{supp}A\subset\mathrm{supp}B$, inequality (2) can be applied to yield

$$\Delta_1=-D(A||B)\le\mathrm{Tr}[A]\log_2\frac{\mathrm{Tr}[B]}{\mathrm{Tr}[A]}.$$

It is now convenient to define $\phi=\mathrm{Tr}[B-A]$, which can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}\phi&=\mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}P\rho_*(I-P)\rho_*P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1/2}\big]\\&=\mathrm{Tr}\big[(I-P)\rho_*^{1/2}\rho_*^{1/2}P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1}P\rho_*\big].\end{aligned}$$

Hence by Schwarz's inequality,

$$\phi\le\big(\mathrm{Tr}\big[(I-P)\rho_*(I-P)\big]\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_*P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1}P\rho_*\big]\big)^{1/2}.$$

By use of $\mathrm{Tr}[(I-P)\rho_*]\le\epsilon$ and $\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_*P\hat{\rho}_*^{-1}P\rho_*\big]=\mathrm{Tr}[B]=\mathrm{Tr}[A]+\phi$, this inequality can be simplified to $\phi\le$

$\epsilon^{1/2}\big(\mathrm{Tr}[A]+\phi\big)^{1/2}$, which, together with $\mathrm{Tr}[A] = \mathrm{Tr}[\hat{\rho}_*] \le 1$, gives

$$\phi \le \frac{\epsilon + \big(\epsilon^2 + 4\epsilon\mathrm{Tr}[A]\big)^{1/2}}{2} \le \frac{\epsilon + \big(\epsilon + 2\epsilon^{1/2}\big)}{2} = \epsilon + \epsilon^{1/2}.$$

Therefore

$$\Delta_1 \le \mathrm{Tr}[A]\log_2 \frac{\mathrm{Tr}[A]+\phi}{\mathrm{Tr}[A]} \le \frac{\epsilon+\epsilon^{1/2}}{\ln 2}. \tag{13}$$

Next, we estimate the second part Δ_2. Let $\kappa_P(\rho_*) = P\rho_*P + (I-P)\rho_*(I-P)$. Since ρ_* and $\kappa_P(\rho_*)$ are density operators, $D(\rho_*||\kappa_P(\rho_*)) \ge 0$, and hence

$$-S(\rho_*) + S(\hat{\rho}_*) + S((I-P)\rho_*(I-P)) \ge 0.$$

From this and (1),

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_2 &= -S(\hat{\rho}_*) + S(\rho_*) \le S((I-P)\rho_*(I-P)) \\ &\le \epsilon\log_2 d + \eta_0(\epsilon),\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where $d = \mathrm{rank}\rho_*$ and η_0 is a monotone increasing function on $[0,\infty)$ defined by (7). Now, the required inequality (6) follows from (12), (13) and (14) with taking the limit $r \to R_\epsilon(X|\rho) - 0$. This completes the proof. □

In randomness extraction against classical side information, the distance from uniform can be upper-bounded as $D(S|G,Z) \le \epsilon\log_2|\mathcal{S}| + \delta/\ln 2$ if G and Z are independent [1], and as

$$D(S|G,Z) \le \epsilon\log_2|\mathcal{S}| + \frac{\delta+\epsilon}{\ln 2}$$

if Z may depend on G [11]. (It should be stated that, in quantum key distribution, adversary's measurement can wait until the choice of hash functions is announced, and so adversary's information Z may depend on the choice G). As stated before, if ρ is purely classical and can be identified with a random variable Z, then the extractable key length $R_\epsilon(X|Z)$ coincides with those given by [1], [11]; hence it may be of interest to compare the results of these works. It can be seen that the upper bound given in this work (see (6)) is larger than that given in [11] (see above) by $\epsilon\log_2(d/\epsilon) + \epsilon^{1/2}/\ln 2$, which is sufficiently small for sufficiently small ϵ.

IV. Asymptotic optimality

In contrast to the conditional von Neumann entropy $S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) = S(\rho_{XY}) - S(\rho_Y)$, the quantum conditional collision entropy $R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ can increase when additional side information is provided; that is,

$$R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_{YZ}) > R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$$

is possible (such side information for the classical collision entropy is called spoiling knowledge [1]). Therefore, we can improve the definition of $R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ be Hilbert spaces, and ρ_{XY} be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$. Then, the quantum collision entropy $\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ of ρ_X conditioned on ρ_Y with optimal side information is defined by

$$\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y) = \sup_{\mathcal{H}_Z,\rho_{XYZ}:\mathrm{Tr}_Z[\rho_{XYZ}]=\rho_{XY}} R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_{YZ}),$$

where the supremum ranges over all Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_Z$ and quantum states ρ_{XYZ} on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ such that $\mathrm{Tr}_Z[\rho_{XYZ}] = \rho_{XY}$. Note that the monotonicity of the relative entropy enables to replace $R_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ in Theorem 3.1 by $\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$.

We now show that $\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ is asymptotically optimal. Let $\mathcal{H}_X$ and $\mathcal{H}_Y$ be Hilbert spaces of finite dimensions d_X and d_Y, respectively, and ρ_{XY} be a quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$. Moreover, let $\mathcal{H}_Z$ be a two-dimensional Hilbert space with an orthonormal basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$, and for $\Delta > 0$, define a quantum state $\rho_{X^nY^nZ}$ on $\mathcal{H}_X^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ by

$$\rho_{X^nY^nZ} = \bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| + (\rho_{XY}^{\otimes n} - \bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n}) \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|,$$

where we have introduced

$$\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n} = \rho_{XY}^{\otimes n}\big\{\rho_{XY}^{\otimes n} \le \mu\big\}$$

with $\mu = 2^{-n(S(\rho_{XY})-\Delta)}$. It is clear from this definition that

$$\mathrm{Tr}_Z[\rho_{X^nY^nZ}] = \rho_{XY}^{\otimes n}.$$

Also, it follows that

$$\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n}^2 \le \mu\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}[\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n}] \ge 1 - \epsilon_{xy}$$

with $\epsilon_{xy} = T_n(d_Xd_Y)2^{-n\Delta}$, where we have defined $T_n(d) = (1+n)^d$ (see e.g. [4]). Now, define $\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}$ and $\check{\rho}_{Y^n}$ by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}_{Y^n} &= \rho_Y^{\otimes n}\big\{\rho_Y^{\otimes n} \ge \lambda\big\}, \\ \check{\rho}_{Y^n} &= \big\{\rho_Y^{\otimes n} \ge \lambda\big\}\bar{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\{\rho_Y^{\otimes n} \ge \lambda\big\},\end{aligned}$$

with $\lambda = 2^{-n(S(\rho_Y)+\Delta)}$ and $\bar{\rho}_{Y^n} = \mathrm{Tr}_{X^n}[\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n}]$. Then,

$$\check{\rho}_{Y^n} \le \hat{\rho}_{Y^n} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n} - \check{\rho}_{Y^n}\big] \le \epsilon_{xy},$$

and so for $\check{c} = 1 - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}$,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\{\check{\rho}_{Y^n} < \check{c}\lambda\big\}\big] &\le \mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\{\check{\rho}_{Y^n} < \check{c}\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\}\big] \\ &= \mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\{\epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}\hat{\rho}_{Y^n} < \hat{\rho}_{Y^n} - \check{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\}\big] \\ &< \mathrm{Tr}\big[\epsilon_{xy}^{-1/2}\big(\hat{\rho}_{Y^n} - \check{\rho}_{Y^n}\big)\big] \le \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big\{\check{\rho}_{Y^n} \ge \check{c}\lambda\big\}\big] > \mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big] - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}.$$

Here, on noting that $\check{\rho}_{Y^n}$ commutes with $\big\{\rho_Y^{\otimes n} \ge \lambda\big\}$, let us introduce the projection P on $\mathcal{H}_Y^{\otimes n} \otimes \mathcal{H}_Z$ defined by

$$P = \big\{\rho_Y^{\otimes n} \ge \lambda\big\}\big\{\check{\rho}_{Y^n} \ge \check{c}\lambda\big\} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|.$$

It can be seen from this definition that

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_*P\big] &> \mathrm{Tr}\big[\hat{\rho}_{Y^n}\big] - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2} - \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_Y^{\otimes n} - \bar{\rho}_{Y^n}\big] \\ &\ge 1 - \epsilon_y - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2} - \epsilon_{xy}\end{aligned}$$

with $\epsilon_y = T_n(d_Y)2^{-n\Delta}$. Moreover, since

$$P\Lambda P = P\mathrm{Tr}_{X^n}\big[\bar{\rho}_{X^nY^n}^2 \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|\big]P \le \mu P\rho_*P$$

and

$$P\rho_*^2P \ge P\rho_*P\rho_*P = P(\check{\rho}_{Y^n}^2 \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|)P \ge \check{c}\lambda P\rho_*P,$$

it follows that

$$P(\Lambda - 2^{-r}\rho_*^2)P \le 0$$

for $r \leq n(S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) - 2\Delta) + \log_2 \check{c}$, and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X^{\otimes n}|\rho_Y^{\otimes n}) &\geq R_\epsilon(\rho_{X^n}|\rho_{Y^n Z}) \\ &\geq n\big(S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) - 2\Delta\big) + \log_2\left(1 - \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2}\right)\end{aligned}$$

for

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_{xy}^{1/2} + \epsilon_{xy} + \epsilon_y.$$

Next, to consider an upper bound, suppose that ρ_{XY} is a classical-quantum state on $\mathcal{H}_X \otimes \mathcal{H}_Y$ of the form

$$\rho_{XY} = \sum_i |i\rangle\langle i| \otimes \rho_i.$$

Then,

$$\begin{aligned}S(\rho_{XY}) &= -\sum_i \mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_Y \rho_Y^{-1/2} \rho_i^{1/2} (\log_2 \rho_i) \rho_i^{1/2} \rho_Y^{-1/2}\big] \\ &\geq -\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_Y \log_2\left(\rho_Y^{-1/2} \Lambda \rho_Y^{-1/2}\right)\big] \\ &\geq -\mathrm{Tr}\big[\rho_Y \log_2\left(2^{-R_0(\rho_X|\rho_Y)} \rho_Y\right)\big] \\ &= R_0(\rho_X|\rho_Y) + S(\rho_Y).\end{aligned}$$

That is, $S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) \geq R_0(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$. Therefore, on noting that $S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) \geq S(\rho_X|\rho_{YZ}) \geq R_0(\rho_X|\rho_{YZ})$ and letting $\Delta = n^{-1/2}$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n} \bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X^{\otimes n}|\rho_Y^{\otimes n}) = S(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$$

with $\lim_{n\to\infty} \epsilon = 0$, which shows that $\bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ is asymptotically optimal.

It follows, on eliminating Δ from the above inequalities, that the lower bound on $\bar{R}_\epsilon$ (for finite n and ϵ) is given as

$$\frac{1}{n} \bar{R}_\epsilon(\rho_X^{\otimes n}|\rho_Y^{\otimes n}) \geq S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) - O\left(\frac{\log_2 n - \log_2 \epsilon}{n}\right),$$

while that on the smooth min-entropy $H_{\min}^\epsilon$ as

$$\frac{1}{n} H_{\min}^\epsilon(X^n|Y^n)_{\rho_{XY}^{\otimes n}} \geq S(\rho_X|\rho_Y) - O\left(\sqrt{\frac{-\log_2 \epsilon}{n}}\right)$$

(see [9]); therefore, the former ensures faster convergence to $S(\rho_X|\rho_Y)$ than the latter.

REFERENCES

[1] C. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, and U. Maurer, "Generalized privacy amplification," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 41, pp. 1915–1923, 1995.

[2] R. Bhatia, *Matrix Analysis*. Berlin: Springer, 1997.

[3] J. L. Carter and M. N. Wegman, "Universal classes of hash functions," *J. Comput. System Sci.*, vol. 18, pp. 143–154, 1979.

[4] I. Csiszár and J. Körner, *Information Theory: Coding Theorems for Discrete Memoryless Systems*, 2nd ed. Cambridge University Press, 2011.

[5] F. Hansen and G. K. Pedersen, "Jensen's operator inequality," *Bull. London Math. Soc.*, vol. 35, pp. 553–564, 2003.

[6] M. Hayashi, "Quantum security analysis via smoothing of renyi entropy of order 2," in *Proceedings of the 7th Conference on Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication, and Cryptography*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, K. Iwama, Ed. Berlin: Springer, 2013, vol. 7582, pp. 128–140.

[7] R. Renner, "Security of quantum key distribution," Ph.D. dissertation, ETH Zurich, 2005.

[8] R. Renner and R. König, "Universally composable privacy amplification against quantum adversaries," in *Proceedings of Theory of Cryptography Conference*, ser. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, J. Kilian, Ed. Berlin: Springer, 2005, vol. 3378, pp. 407–425.

[9] M. Tomamichel, R. Colbeck, and R. Renner, "A fully quantum asymptotic equipartition property," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 55, no. 12, pp. 5840–5847, Dec 2009.

[10] M. Tomamichel, C. Schaffner, A. Smith, and R. Renner, "Leftover hashing against quantum side information," *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, vol. 57, pp. 5524–5535, 2011.

[11] Y. Watanabe, "Privacy amplification for quantum key distribution," *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.*, vol. 40, pp. F99–F104, 2007.

[12] M. N. Wegman and J. L. Carter, "New hash functions and their use in authentication and set equality," *J. Comput. System Sci.*, vol. 22, pp. 265–279, 1981.